

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7 REBECCA L. BRADSHAW, et al.,  
8 Plaintiffs,  
9 v.  
10 OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL  
11 MI5, et al.,  
12 Defendants.

Case No. 25-cv-03983-SI

**ORDER DISMISSING CASE FOR  
LACK OF JURISDICTION**

13 On May 7, 2025, self-represented plaintiff Rebecca Bradshaw filed this lawsuit against the  
14 “Office of the Inspector General for MI5, DNA Warfare and Research and Development  
15 Acquisition” (“MI5”) and former President George H.W. Bush.<sup>1</sup> It appears from the complaint that  
16 Bradshaw filed the lawsuit on behalf of herself and her mother, Patricia Ralph. The complaint  
17 alleges that Bradshaw was tortured (or subjected to “counter torture”) pursuant to an order issued  
18 by President George H.W. Bush when he was the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, and  
19 that the torture/counter-torture was carried out remotely by the British intelligence agency MI5. The  
20 complaint alleges, among other things, that Bradshaw was subjected to “forced touchless enhanced  
21 interrogation of intelligence surveillance records,” and that her and her mother’s DNA “was copied  
22 unlawfully (and later confiscated) from large private libraries in Israel and Rome . . . .” Compl. at  
23 p. 5-6. Bradshaw alleges that the torture began when she was a minor in 1978 and “is a crime-in-  
24 progress, and present obstructions to investigative processes are originating via a joint British and  
25 U.S. order with the employment of criminal torture from at least five other states who have self-  
26 identified through assaults.” *Id.* at 5. Although difficult to understand, the complaint appears to  
27

28 <sup>1</sup> President George H.W. Bush died in 2018.

1 claim that President Bush was involved in child trafficking and employed “former Nazis as counter-  
2 torture.” *Id.* at 6. The forms of torture/counter-torture include but are not limited to “Hibernation  
3 of neuro-regenerative cutaneous repair to increase injury and prevent repair”; “Use of deep sleep  
4 states for unlawful operative blood removal and cosmetic procedures that can misrepresent  
5 identity”; and “Use of Particle-level warfare to cloak pain and resistance during electrocution  
6 assaults.” *Id.* at 1. The complaint alleges claims under the United States Constitution and federal  
7 and state criminal statutes.

8 The Court has the independent obligation to ensure that it has jurisdiction over this lawsuit.  
9 *See Henderson ex rel. Henderson v. Shinseki*, 562 U.S. 428, 434 (2011). “A paid complaint that is  
10 ‘obviously frivolous’ does not confer subject matter jurisdiction and may be dismissed *sua sponte*  
11 before service of process.” *Franklin v. Murphy*, 745 F.2d 1221, 1227 n. 6 (9th Cir. 1984) (quoting  
12 *Hagans v. Lavine*, 415 U.S. 528, 537 (1974)). “Claims that are essentially fictitious include those  
13 that allege ‘bizarre conspiracy theories, any fantastic government manipulations of their will or mind  
14 [or] any sort of supernatural intervention.’” *Newby v. Obama*, 681 F. Supp. 2d 53, 56 (D.D.C. 2010)  
15 (quoting *Best v. Kelly*, 39 F.3d 328, 330 (D.C. Cir. 1994) (dismissing as frivolous and fictitious  
16 claims that the President and government agents stalked the plaintiff, interfered with her job to  
17 prevent her from attending confirmation hearings, illegally classified her as a national security risk,  
18 and illegally surveilled her through a “Home guard surveillance network”); *see also Bivolarevic v.*  
19 *U.S. C.I.A.*, Case No. 09-4260 SBA, 2010 WL 890147, at \*2 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 8, 2010) (dismissing  
20 as frivolous and fictitious claims that the CIA subjected the plaintiff to “voice to skull technology”  
21 used as a “mind control weapon”).

22 The Court has reviewed the complaint and concludes that it does not demonstrate a basis for  
23 federal subject matter jurisdiction. Similar to the plaintiffs’ claims in *Newby* and *Bivolarevic*, the  
24 allegations of the complaint are fictitious and legally frivolous. Plaintiffs allege a decades-long  
25 campaign of “remote torture” conducted by a foreign government and orchestrated by former  
26 President George H.W. Bush when he was at the CIA. The allegations are “sufficiently fantastical  
27 to defy reality as we know it[,]” and thus the Court need not take the allegations as true. *Ashcroft*  
28 *v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 696 (2009) (Souter, J. dissenting). For the same reasons, the Court concludes

1 that leave to amend would be futile. Accordingly, the Court DISMISSES this case for lack of  
2 jurisdiction.

3

4 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

5  
6 Dated: June 25, 2025



---

7 SUSAN ILLSTON  
8 United States District Judge